(c) what are the reasons that responsibilities for alleged diversion of funds are not fixed; and

(d) the steps taken to ensure fool proof system for proper utilisation of funds?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI SATYABRATA MOOKHERJEE): (a) to (d) Yes Sir. The Government has proposed to get the impact assessment of all Centrally Sponsored Schemes for which evaluation has not been undertaken, done by Planning Commission or outside professional agencies in a time bound manner. Considering the large number of Centrally sponsored schemes under implementation, the demand for impact evaluation results is much larger than what the Government agencies, such as, Programme Evaluation Organisation and In-house Monitoring and Evaluation units of Ministries can deliver. The findings of evaluation studies, which include an assessment of physical and financial performance and impact of schemes, are made available to the implementing Ministries/Departments and State Governments for follow-up actions. The steps taken for improving the performance of programme formulation and implementation include convergence and weeding out of plan schemes, project approach with time bound targets for monitoring, mid-term evaluation and detailed impact studies of Centrally sponsored Schemes. In addition, the proposals of sthe Tenth Plan include, *inter-alia,* reforms of civil services to ensure transparency and accountability in implementation of development programmes.

BPL population

1042. SHRI CO. POULOSE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons included in the Below Poverty Line and Above Poverty Line category, State-wise;

(b) whether it is a fact that in most of the States the number of BPL families identified by the Planning Commission were less in number as compared to the number of families estimated by the State administration; and

(c) if so, the estimates of both the authorities alongwith the reasons for such difference, State-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI SATYABRATA MOOKHERJEE): (a) Based on the data from the latest large sample survey of the 55th Round on household consumer expenditure conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), the Planning Commission has estimated 260.25 million persons living below poverty line in 1999-2000. Poverty line is being used to separate poor *{i.e.* persons living below the poverty line) from the non-poor *(i.e.* persons living above the poverty line). The remaining population, which is not poor is above poverty line category. The State-wise estimates of poverty ratio for the year 1999-2000 are given in Statement I (*See* below).

(b) The comparable estimates of the number of BPL families estimated by the Planning Comission and BPL families identified by the State Governments are not available. The Planning Commission estimates poverty for the years for which NSS data on household consumer expenditure from the large surveys is available and the latest such data is available for the year 1999-2000 (55th Round).The State Governments estimate BPL families at the begining of the Five Year Plans. Latest. BPL estimates made by the State Governments are available for the year 1997. Moreover, Planning Commission estimates poverty on individual basis whereas State Governments estimation is made on the household basis.

(c) The State-wise estimates of percentage of persons living below poverty line as calculated by the Planning Commission for the year 1999-2000 and the percentage of families identified to be living below poverty line by the State Governments for the year 1997 are given in Statement II.

Statement I

Number of Persons Below Poverty Line by States 1999-2000

(Lakhs)

SI. No.	States/U.T.'s	Rural	Urban	Combined
1.	Andhra Pradesh	58.13	60.88	119.01
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3.80	0.18	3.98
3.	Assam	92.17	2.38	94.55

(Lakhs)

SI. No.	States/U.T.'s	Rural	Urban	Combined
4.	Bihar	376.51	49.13	425.64
5.	Goa	0.11	0.59	0.70
6.	Gujarat	39.80	28.09	67.89
7.	Haryana	11.94	5.39	17.34
8.	Himachal Pradesh	4.84	0.29	5.12
9.	Jammu and Kashmir	2.97	0.49	3.46
10.	Karnataka	59.91	44.49	104.40
11.	Kerala	20.97	20.07	41.04
12.	Madhya Pradesh	217.32	81.22	298.54
13.	Maharashtra	125.12	102.87	227.99
14.	Manipur	6.53	0.66	7.19
15.	Meghalaya	7.89	0.34	8.23
16.	Mizoram	1.40	0.45	1.85
17.	Nagaland	5.21	0.28	5.49
18.	Orissa	143.69	25.40	169.09
19.	Punjab	10.20	4.29	14.49
20.	Raiasthan	55.06	26.78	81.83
21.	Sikkim	2.00	0.04	2.05
22.	Tamil Nadu	80.51	49.97	130.48
23.	Tripura	12.53	0.49	13.02
24.	Uttar Pradesh	412.01	117.88	529.89
25.	West Bengal	180.11	33.38	213.49
26.	A and N island	0.58	0.24	0.82
27.	Chandigarh	0.06	0.45	0.51
28.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	0.30	0.03	0.33
29.	Daman and Diu	0.01	0.05	0.06
30.	Delhi	0.07	11.42	11.49
31.	Lakshadweep	0.03	0.08	0.11
32.	Pondicherry	0.64	1.77	2.41
	ALL INDIA:	1932.43	670.07	2602.50

NOTES:-

1. Poverty Ratio of Assam is used for Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaiand and Tripura.
2. Poverty Line of Maharashtra and expenditure distribution of Goa is used to estimate poverty ratio of Goa.
3. Poverty Line of Himachal Pradesh and expenditure distribution of Jammu and Kashmir is used to estimate poverty ratio of Jammu and Kashmir.
4. Poverty Ratio of Tamil Nadu is used for Pondicherry and A and N Island.
5. Urban Poverty Ratio of Punjab used for both rural and urban poverty of Chandigarh.
6. Poverty line of Maharashtra and expenditure distribution of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is used to estimate poverty ratio of Dadra and Nagar Havell.
7. Poverty Ratio of Goa is used for Daman and Diu.
8. Poverty Ratio of Kerala is used for Lakshadweep.
9. Urban Poverty Ratio of Rajasthan may be treated as tentative.

Statement II

State-wise percentage of families/persons Below Poverty Line in rural areas

Sl. No.	State/U.T.'s	State Govt. Estimates* 1997 (Families)	Plan Com. Estimates 1999-2000 (Persons)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	39.91	11.05
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	78.39	40.04
3.	Assam	60.00	40.04
4.	Bihar	49.64	44.30
5.	Goa	17.01	1.35
6.	Gujarat	35.45	13.17
7.	Haryana	24.25	8.27
8.	Himachal Pradesh	27.59	7.94
9.	Jammu and Kashmir	57.92	3.97
10.	Karnataka	33.99	17.38
11.	Kerala	36.56	9.38
12.	Madhya Pradesh	43.87	37.06
13.	Maharashtra	35.07	23.72

SI.No.	State/U.T.'s	State Govt. Estimates* 1997 (Families)	Plan Com. Estimates 1999-2000 (Persons)
14.	Manipur	67.54	40.04
15.	Meghalaya	55.48	40.04
16.	Mizoram	67.07	40.04
17.	Nagaland	60.39	40.04
18.	Orissa	65.47	48.01
19.	Punjab	27.90	6.35
20.	Rajasthan	30.99	13.74
21.	Sikkim	—	40.04
22.	Tamil Nadu	29.16	20.55
23.	Tripura	66.81	40.04
24.	Uttar Pradesh	36.91	31.22
25.	West Bengal	44.40	31.85
26.	A & N Island	21.25	20.55
27.	Chandigarh	—	5.75
28.	Dadra and Nagar Havel	65.67	17.57
29.	Daman and Diu	3.68	1.35
30.	Delhi	—	0.40
31.	Lakshadweep	10.26	9.38
32.	Pondicherry	47.37	20.55
	ALL INDIA:	41.05	27.09

*Source is Ministry of Rural Development.

Delay in ongoing infrastructure projects

†1043: SHRI LAJPAT RAI:
SHRI RAM JETHMALANI:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the ongoing projects of National Highways, Railways, Rural Development, Unban Development and Power are likely

†Origlnal notice of the question was received in Hindi.